

Remarks/Arguments

Claim 1 has previously been cancelled. Claims 2-10, all of the remaining claims in the application, have been rejected.

The present invention relates to a device for connecting a centralized wireless network to another network, in which the device is compliant with IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan 2 standards. As pointed out in ¶'s 0002 and 0007 of the instant specification, according to these standards, only one access point is allowed per wireless basic service set. It is therefore impossible to use a wireless network of this type to act as a backbone for connecting other networks. The instant invention solves this problem by providing a wireless station having a bridge module and a link management module, such that devices connected to another network will appear as wireless stations to the access point. Compliance with the standards is maintained.

The following sets forth independent Claim 10, with parenthesized references to the instant specification and drawing:

10. Device for connecting a centralized wireless network (201, ¶0025) to at least one other network (207, ¶0025), said device being a wireless station compliant to the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards (¶0023), and further comprising:

    a wireless interface (203, ¶0029) for managing more than one MAC address for association with an access point of said centralized wireless network, wherein said associations are as defined by the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards (¶0023);

    a bridge module (301, ¶0029) for managing a plurality of ports for connecting to respective networks; and

    a link management module (302, ¶0029) for managing associations of different MAC addresses corresponding to devices connected to said at least one other network with said access point of said centralized

wireless network such that said devices connected to said at least one other network will appear as wireless stations to the access point (¶0027).

Cited US 6,400,702 to Meier relates to a network which complies with IEEE 802.3. See column 3, lines 27-29. Meier uses multiple access points 107, 112, 113, 114 and 115. See column 20, lines 10-12. It is therefore clear that Meier does not comply with IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan 2 standards.

Nowhere does Meier show or suggest:

“said device being a wireless station compliant to IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan 2 standards”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 10. It is therefore clear that Meier does not affect the patentability of Claim 10.

The Examiner seems to have some confusion between an access point and a wireless station. A wireless network in accordance with IEEE 802.11 generally includes one access point and several wireless stations, as illustrated in Fig. 1 and page 2, lines 1 – 3 of the present specification. An access point having a bridge function is known in the art, as indicated on page 1, line 14 of the present specification. What is not known from Meier, and that which is the subject of the present invention, is a wireless station with a bridging function. Specifically, the device of claim 10 is a wireless station (“said device being a wireless station”). The device (wireless station) has “a wireless interface ... for association with an access point”. That is, very clearly the “device” is not an access point (wireless or otherwise). The “device” (wireless station) has a “bridge module”. The device in Meier (see col. 20, lines 28 – 34, col. 22, lines 29 – 35 and Fig. 9) “shows a wireless domain access point”.

Claim 2 is dependent from Claim 10, and adds further advantageous features. The Appellants submit that dependent Claim 2 is patentable as its parent Claim 10.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3-9 as unpatentable over Meier in view of US 5,570,366 to Baker et al. Baker et al relates to a device for preventing transmissions to a wireless network that will not be responded to by a receiving terminal. See column 2, lines 25-29. Since Baker et al use multiple access points, as shown in Figures 3 and 4, it is clear that Baker et al does not comply with IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan 2 standards. It is therefore clear that even if the structure of Meier were to be combined with the structure of Baker et al, the patentability of Claim 10 would not be affected.

The Examiner has also cited Doyle. Doyle describes a bridging apparatus can operate as an access point device between an IEEE 802.11 wireless network and a non-IEEE 802.11 wired network. The combination of Meier and Doyle teaches a wireless access point with a bridge. The combination does not disclose a wireless station with a bridge.

Since Claims 3-9 are dependent from Claim 10 and add further advantageous features, the Applicants submit that dependent Claims 3-9 are patentable as their parent Claim 10.

The Examiner has newly cited, but not relied upon, US 6,934,263 to Seaman and US 7,379,459 to Ohnishi. Applicants have reviewed these newly cited references, and believe that they are no more pertinent to the claimed invention than the references upon which the Examiner has relied.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sebastien Perrot et al.

by: /Catherine A. Cooper/  
Catherine A. Cooper, attorney  
Reg. No. 40,877  
Tel. No. (609) 734-6440

Thomson Licensing LLC  
Patent Operations  
2 Independence Way  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: February 9, 2011